UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/586,722	06/05/2000	Robert I. G. McLean	C1197-991110	7897

26379	7590	09/20/2004

GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP
2000 UNIVERSITY AVENUE
E. PALO ALTO, CA 94303-2248

EXAMINER
COLON, CATHERINE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/586,722	MCLEAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	C. Michelle Colon	3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 June 2004</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The following is a Final Office Action in response to the communication received

on June 9, 2004. Claims 1, 5, 10 and 18 have been amended. Claims 1-22 are now

pending in this application.

Response to Amendment

2.   Applicant's amendments to claims 1, 5, 10 and 18 are acknowledged. However,

the amendments are insufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection set forth in the

previous Office Action because the recitation of technological arts occurs only in the

preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely

recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body

of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the

process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535

F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88

USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). Accordingly, the claims should recite technological arts

within their bodies to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's amendments have been fully considered, but are found

unpersuasive. In the Remarks, Applicant argues the following: 1) that Eder does not

disclose methods that relate to individual value streams of an enterprise; 2) that Eder

does not disclose methods relating to a multi-level hierarchy in which assumed

variables positioned at a lower level in the hierarchy influence one or more assumed variables positioned at a higher level in the hierarchy; 3) that Eder does not disclose authorizing a first user to alter variables; 4) that Eder does not disclose a non-financial metric; 5) that Eder does not disclose methods for one user to retrieve the altered assumptions of another user in order to view the outcomes for a value stream of a business enterprise based on the other user's assumptions; 6) that Eder does not disclose a base case scenario; and 7) that Eder does not disclose providing real-time feedback.

In response to argument 1), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner first notes that Applicant references examples and definitions in the specification to clarify language in the claims (see page 11 of the Remarks). Examiner also notes that Applicant explains at length the present invention in the Remarks (see page 7, last paragraph through page 9), however, various descriptions used to argue against Eder are not recited in the claims. For example, Applicant emphasizes that the present invention is not concerned with intangible assets; yet the claims do not recite being concerned with any particular type of asset. Applicant also emphasizes that the present invention's main purpose is business valuation over time, not at a point in time; yet there is no recitation in the claims referencing time-related criteria for valuation. Thus, in response to Applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of Applicant's invention as they have been described in the Remarks, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although

the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification
are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057
(Fed. Cir. 1993). Additionally, Examiner respectfully submits that Eder does disclose
individual value streams of an enterprise in column 11, lines 40-46 where Eder teaches
an entity or group that has provided and is expected to provide economic benefit to the
enterprise, which, incidentally, is in line with Applicant's example of a value stream as
discussed in the first full paragraph on page 12 of the Remarks.

In response to argument 2), Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed in
the Office Action, in column 11, lines 15-63, Eder teaches that the "Value of current-
operation" is comprised of revenue, expense and capital components, which are further
comprised of sub-components. Thus, the sub-components influence the components,
which influence the value of current-operation. The limitation in the claims recite that
the variables in the lower level of the hierarchy influence *one or more* variables in the
higher level of the hierarchy, in contrast to Applicant's assertion that Eder must teach a
many to many relationship between the levels of the hierarchy. Therefore, Eder does
teach a multi-level hierarchy in which assumed variables positioned at a lower level in
the hierarchy influence one or more assumed variables positioned at a higher level in
the hierarchy.

In response to argument 3), Examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 20, lines
14-18, Eder discloses that the system allows (i.e., authorizes) a user to edit (i.e., alter)
the component and subcomponent definitions (i.e., variables according to their level in
the hierarchy). If Applicant means something more specific by the limitation,

"authorizing a user to alter...variables...according to a level of the hierarchy in which the assumed variables are positioned," Examiner suggests amending the claims for clarification since the phrase "according to" is broad and does not specify how the authorization and the levels in the hierarchy are even related.

In response to argument 4), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner notes that on page 16 of the Remarks, Applicant again relies on definitions in the specification to clarify the meaning of non-financial metric in the claims. Applicant is reminded that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Additionally, in column 19, lines 27-30, Eder explicitly discloses non-cash and other non-financial metrics and in column 19, lines 38-41 also discloses that a user can designate some or all of the subcomponents for evaluation, thus resulting in non-financial metrics if only the non-financial subcomponents are used for evaluation.

In response to argument 5), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner respectfully submits that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., one user retrieving altered assumptions of another user) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, the argument is moot.

In response to argument 6), Examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 46, lines 54-60, Eder teaches users defining "base case" scenarios which place the system in

goal seeking mode for each simulation (i.e., assumption) so the user can acquire

recommendations for changes to be made based on the differences found between the

base case scenario and each simulation. Also in column 19, lines 38-42, Eder

discloses giving users the option to designate which variables to use in the simulation

(to be altered), thus enabling users to designate which variables to maintain. The claim

does not recite how the base case scenario variables are defined, rather that they are

"developed," thus, the claim does not preclude a reference from teaching that user input

can define, or even change, a base case scenario.

In response to argument 7), Examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 5, lines

1-9; column 8, lines 1-25; column 20, lines 14-18; Figure 16, Eder discloses a user

inputting value information and the system displaying the result of the evaluation based

on the user-inputted values. Users can even redefine values after a first evaluation is

displayed to them. Thus, the user receives real-time feedback based on the evaluation

of the inputted values. Additionally, Examiner notes that Applicant explains at length on

page 22 of the Remarks the Applicant's *intended* meaning of real-time feedback and

references pages in the specification; however, none of the definitions in the Remarks

or the specification are expressly recited in the claims. Examiner respectfully submits

that real-time feedback is a very broad term with various connotations. Since the claim

does not recite any definitions from the specification, any reasonable interpretation is

appropriate.

Lastly, Examiner notes that throughout the arguments, Applicant applies

definitions for the invention and references to the specification that are not expressly

recited in the rejected claims (see some examples discussed above). Examiner

suggests amending the claims so that they more accurately reflect the definitions and

references to the specification applied in the arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

5.   Claims 1-13 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

(1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and

(2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

As per the first prong of the test, for a claimed invention to be statutory, the

claimed invention must be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e.,

abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or

advance the technological arts fail to promote the "progress of science and the useful

arts" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences) and therefore are found

to be non-statutory subject matter. For a process claim to be satisfactory, the recited

process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts.

In the present case, the recited steps in claims 1-13 and 18-22 of merely

processing data relating to the performance of a business enterprise do not apply,

involve, use, or advance the technological arts since all of the recited steps can be

performed in person or by use of a pencil and paper and without the need of a computer

or other technology.

As per the second prong of the test, for a claimed invention to be statutory, the

claimed invention must produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. In the present

case, the claimed invention produces outcomes for value streams (i.e., concrete) in

order to determine the performance of a business enterprise (i.e., useful and tangible).

Although the recited process produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result,

since the claimed invention, as a whole, is not within the technological arts as explained

above, claims 1-13 and 18-22 are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7.   Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eder

(U.S. 6,321,205).

As per claim 1, Eder discloses a computer-implemented method of processing

data relating to the performance of a business enterprise in creating value, comprising:

developing a data structure including assumed variables that have an influence on a value stream of the business enterprise, the assumed variables in said data structure being arranged in a multi-level hierarchy in which assumed variables positioned at a lower level in the hierarchy influence one or more assumed variables positioned at a higher level in the hierarchy (col. 11, lines 15-63; The "Value of current-operation" is comprised of components revenue, expense and capital, which are further comprised of sub-components. Thus, the sub-components influence the components, which influence the value of current-operation.);

determining a first outcome for the value stream of the business enterprise based upon the assumed variables (col. 12, lines 1-30; The component values are calculated to determine the operation value.);

authorizing a user to alter one or more of the assumed variables according to a level of the hierarchy in which the assumed variables are positioned (col. 20, lines 14-22; col. 21, line 34-col. 22, line 8; Users can alter the variables when performing the calculations.); and

determining a second outcome for the value stream of the business enterprise taking into account the altered assumed variables (col. 6, lines 44-64; col. 23, lines 12-15; The system allows the user to generate changes in the variables when performing the calculations.).

As per claim 2, Eder discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the first outcome includes a present financial value of the value stream (col. 12, lines 1-30; Revenue, expense and capital are indicative of financial value.).

As per claim 3, Eder discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the first outcome includes a non-financial metric (col. 19, lines 27-30; Figure 5B; The first outcome can also include non-financial data.).

As per claim 4, Eder discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising:

authorizing each of a plurality of users to alter the assumed variables according to a level of the hierarchy in which the assumed variables are positioned (abstract; col. 20, lines 14-22; col. 21, line 34-col. 22, line 8; Figure 5A; Users can alter the variables when performing the calculations.);

storing, for each altered assumed variable, an identification of the user who made the alteration (col. 6, lines 44-64; col. 8, lines 1-30; col. 9, line 53-col. 10, line 1; col. 10, lines 6-18; Figures 4, 5A, 5B and 16; Users can track the changes they make in the system over time. User input is also stored in databases.); and

determining alternate outcomes for the value stream of the business enterprise taking into account selected aggregations of the altered assumed variables wherein the selected aggregations are formed according to the stored identifications (col. 6, lines 44-64; col. 20, lines 18-22; Figure 1; The system determines alternate outcomes based on the altered data.).

As per claims 5 and 18, Eder discloses a computer-implemented method of processing data relating to the performance of a business enterprise in creating value, comprising:

developing a data structure including a plurality of assumed variables that have

an influence on a value stream of the business enterprise, the data structure having a

portion which defines a base case scenario for the business enterprise (col. 11, lines

15-63; The "Value of current-operation" is comprised of components revenue, expense

and capital, which are further comprised of sub-components. Thus, the sub-

components influence the components, which influence the value of current-operation.);

determining an outcome for the value stream of the business enterprise based

upon the assumed variables of the base case scenario (col. 12, lines 1-30; The

component values are calculated to determine the operation value.);

altering, by a plurality of users, selected ones of the plurality of assumed

variables (col. 20, lines 14-22; col. 21, line 34-col. 22, line 8; Users can alter the

variables when performing the calculations.);

storing each altered assumed variable in the data structure in association with an

identifier of the user who made the alteration, and maintaining the assumed variables of

the base case scenario unchanged by the plurality of users (col. 6, lines 44-64; col. 8,

lines 1-30; col. 9, line 53-col. 10, line 1; col. 10, lines 6-18; Figures 4, 5A, 5B and 16;

Users can track the changes they make in the system over time. User input is also

stored in databases.);

aggregating selected ones of the altered assumed variables and selected ones of

the assumed variables of the base case scenario in accordance with the stored

identifiers to form one or more alternate scenarios (col. 11, lines 36-52; Resulting values

can be added together to form alternate scenarios.); and

determining an outcome for the value stream of the business enterprise based

upon each of the alternate scenarios (col. 6, lines 44-64; col. 20, lines 18-22; Figure 1;

The system determines alternate outcomes based on the altered data.).

As per claims 6 and 19, Eder discloses the method according to claims 5 and 18,

wherein the assumed variables are arranged in a multi-level hierarchy in which

assumed variables positioned at a lower level in the hierarchy influence one or more

assumed variables positioned at a higher level in the hierarchy (col. 11, lines 15-63; The

"Value of current-operation" is comprised of components revenue, expense and capital,

which are further comprised of sub-components. Thus, the sub-components influence

the components, which influence the value of current-operation.).

As per claims 7 and 20, Eder discloses the method according to claims 6 and 19,

wherein said altering further comprises authorizing each of the users to alter the

assumed variables according to a level of the hierarchy in which the assumed variables

are positioned (col. 20, lines 14-22; col. 21, line 34-col. 22, line 8; Users can alter the

variables when performing the calculations.).

As per claims 8 and 21, Eder discloses the method according to claims 5 and 18,

wherein the outcome of the base case scenario includes a present financial value of the

value stream (col. 12, lines 1-30; Revenue, expense and capital are indicative of

financial value.).

As per claim 9, Eder discloses the method according to claim 8, wherein the

outcome of the base case scenario includes a non-financial metric (col. 19, lines 27-30;

Figure 5B; The first outcome can also include non-financial data.).

As per claim 10, Eder discloses a computer-implemented method of processing

data relating to the performance of a business enterprise in creating value, comprising:

developing a data structure including a plurality of assumed variables that have

an influence on a value stream of the business enterprise, the data structure having a

portion which defines a base case scenario for the business enterprise (col. 11, lines

15-63; The "Value of current-operation" is comprised of components revenue, expense

and capital, which are further comprised of sub-components. Thus, the sub-

components influence the components, which influence the value of current-operation.);

determining an outcome for the value stream of the business enterprise based

upon the assumed variables of the base case scenario (col. 12, lines 1-30; The

component values are calculated to determine the operation value.);

providing real-time feedback, by each of a plurality of users, on the value creation

performance of the business enterprise (col. 20, lines 14-22; col. 21, line 34-col. 22, line

8; Users can alter the variables when performing the calculations.);

storing the real-time feedback in the data structure in association with an

identifier of the user who provided each portion of the feedback, and maintaining the

assumed variables of the base case scenario unchanged by the plurality of users (col.

6, lines 44-64; col. 8, lines 1-30; col. 9, line 53-col. 10, line 1; col. 10, lines 6-18; Figures

4, 5A, 5B and 16; Users can track the changes they make in the system over time.

User input is also stored in databases.);

aggregating selected ones of the portions of the feedback and selected ones of the assumed variables of the base case scenario (col. 11, lines 36-52; Resulting values can be added together to form alternate scenarios.);

determining an outcome for the value stream of the business enterprise based upon the selected ones of the portions of the feedback and the selected ones of the assumed variables of the base case scenario (col. 6, lines 44-64; col. 20, lines 18-22; Figure 1; The system determines alternate outcomes based on the altered data.).

As per claim 11, Eder discloses the method according to claim 10, wherein the assumed variables are arranged in a multi-level hierarchy in which assumed variables positioned at a lower level in the hierarchy influence one or more assumed variables positioned at a higher level in the hierarchy (col. 11, lines 15-63; The "Value of current-operation" is comprised of components revenue, expense and capital, which are further comprised of sub-components. Thus, the sub-components influence the components, which influence the value of current-operation.).

As per claim 12, Eder discloses the method according to claim 10, wherein the outcome of the base case scenario includes a present financial value of the value stream (col. 12, lines 1-30; Revenue, expense and capital are indicative of financial value.).

As per claim 13, Eder discloses the method according to claim 10, wherein the outcome of the base case scenario includes a non-financial metric (col. 19, lines 27-30; Figure 5B; The first outcome can also include non-financial data.).

As per claim 14, Eder discloses a system for processing data relating to the performance of a business enterprise in creating value, comprising:

a memory device for storing a data structure including assumed variables that have an influence on a value stream of the business enterprise, the assumed variables in said data structure being arranged in a multi-level hierarchy in which assumed variables positioned at a lower level in the hierarchy influence one or more assumed variables positioned at a higher level in the hierarchy (col. 11, lines 15-63; The "Value of current-operation" is comprised of components revenue, expense and capital, which are further comprised of sub-components. Thus, the sub-components influence the components, which influence the value of current-operation.);

means for authorizing a user to alter one or more of the assumed variables according to a level of the hierarchy in which the assumed variables are positioned (col. 20, lines 14-22; col. 21, line 34-col. 22, line 8; Users can alter the variables when performing the calculations.);

a filter for selecting certain ones of the assumed variables and for selecting certain ones of the altered assumed variables (col. 12, lines 44-67; col. 16, lines 24-27; Figures 5A and 5B; The system selects certain variables for analysis and based on certain criteria may prompt the user for additional or altered data.); and

a calculation engine for receiving the certain ones of the assumed variables and the certain ones of the altered assumed variables from the filter and for determining an outcome for the financial value stream of the business enterprise based upon the certain ones of the assumed variables and the certain ones of the altered assumed

variables (col. 6, lines 44-64; col. 23, lines 12-24; The system calculates the received variables and compares them with previously specified variables.).

As per claim 15, Eder discloses the system according to claim 14, wherein the outcome of the base case scenario includes a present financial value of the value stream (col. 12, lines 1-30; Revenue, expense and capital are indicative of financial value.).

As per claim 16, Eder discloses the system according to claim 14, wherein the outcome of the base case scenario includes a non-financial metric (col. 19, lines 27-30; Figure 5B; The first outcome can also include non-financial data.).

As per claim 17, Eder discloses the system according to claim 14, further comprising:

means for authorizing each of a plurality of users to alter the assumed variables according to a level of the hierarchy in which the assumed variables are positioned, wherein for each altered assumed variable, an identification of the user who made the alteration is stored in the data structure (abstract; col. 20, lines 14-22; col. 21, line 34-col. 22, line 8; Figure 5A; Users can alter the variables when performing the calculations.);

means for determining alternate outcomes for the value stream of the business enterprise taking into account selected aggregations of the altered assumed variables wherein the selected aggregations are formed according to the stored identifications (col. 6, lines 44-64; col. 8, lines 1-30; col. 9, line 53-col. 10, line 1; col. 10, lines 6-18; col. 20, lines 18-22; Figure 1, 4, 5A, 5B and 16; The system determines alternate

outcomes based on the altered data. Users can track the changes they make in the system over time. User input is also stored in databases.).

As per claim 22, Eder discloses the method according to claim 18, wherein the outcome of the base case scenario includes a non-financial metric (col. 19, lines 27-30; Figure 5B; The first outcome can also include non-financial data.).

Conclusion

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Michelle Colon whose telephone number is 703-605-4251. The examiner can normally be reached Monday – Friday from 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tariq Hafiz, can be reached at 703-305-9643.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-

1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

703-872-9306	[Official Communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]
703-746-7202	[For status inquiries, draft communication, labeled "Proposed" or "Draft"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal

Drive, Arlington, VA 7th floor receptionist.

cmc
September 15, 2004

TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600